

**EIAF Grant Review Rating Sheet
For Impact Advisory Committee Use Only**

Project Name and EIAF # _____

Committee Member Name _____

1. Energy/Mineral Relationship: Project addresses impacts related to energy/mineral boom and bust cycles, industry is aware of the project, applicant addresses impacts of various types and extents. The program maintains flexibility to respond to areas throughout the state with lesser impacts. CATEGORY WEIGHT 25 Use either Current or Historical/Impending impacts, not both	Criteria Description:	Rating: Score subject to changes based on information provided at hearings	Score only current or historical/impending not both	Point Total
Current Impacts – Using the metrics of employees, permits, and production, the overall county ranking will be grouped as described:	Significantly Impacted (1 – 21) Substantially Impacted (23 – 45) Impacted (46 – 64)	3 2 1		(Score x Weight of 25) =
Historical Impacts – Using the metrics of economic impacts through mine closure or environmental damage; or Impending Impacts – impending mine openings, exploratory drilling	Significantly Impacted (1 – 21) Substantially Impacted (22-40) Impacted (41 – 64)	3 2 1		(Score x Weight of 25) =
2. Local Commitment: Cash, applicant's fiscal capacity and leveraging of other resources, all appropriate funding sources are at the table, other funding avenues (lease-purchase, utility savings, etc.) project cannot be funded by other sources. Dollar-for-dollar match, where local circumstances permit, is encouraged. CATEGORY WEIGHT 25	Criteria Description:	Rating: Score subject to changes based on information provided at hearings	Score	Point Total
Applicant Cash	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Excellent: 50% cash or more Good: 25-49% Cash Low: Less than 25% Cash No Cash 	3 2 1 0		(Score x Weight of 25) =
Leveraging (other cash + in-kind)	Leveraging rating scale <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Excellent: 50% cash or more Good: 25% to 49% Cash Low: any leveraging No Leveraging of Funds	3 2 1 0		(Score x Weight of 25) =
3. Demonstrates and Addresses Community Need: The overall feasibility of the proposed project. Demonstration of a documented need, project solves identified problem, relationship to community plans, goals and priorities, project maintains community heritage, public safety, health and citizen welfare. CATEGORY WEIGHT 20	Criteria Description:	Rating:	Score	Point Total

Significance of project	Water, sewer, drainage, highly impacted roads, housing	3		(Score x Weight of 20) =	
	Health, public safety, capital equipment, economic development, schools, planning	2			
	Government administration, libraries, cultural, other	1			
	Project shows a demonstrated relationship to a community plan	1		(Score x Weight of 20) =	
	Strong energy conservation or renewable energy component to the project	1		(Score x Weight of 20) =	
4. Ability to Pay The review of the local government's financial status includes, but is not limited to, fund balances, rates, revenue raising capacity, and debt ratios. CATEGORY WEIGHT 10		Criteria Description:	Rating:	Score	Point Total
To receive maximum points, the applicant must be able to show it is maximizing use of its resources based on its financial condition	Excellent	3		(Score x Weight of 10) =	
	Very Good	2			
	Good	1			
	No effort	0			
5. Readiness to Go: Implementation of project in short time period (less than 1 year), ability to plan and budget projects. CATEGORY WEIGHT 10		Criteria Description:	Rating:	Score	Point Total
Project Implementation Schedule	Implementation can begin: <ul style="list-style-type: none">High: Less than 12 monthsMedium: Within 12-18 monthsLow: Longer than 18 months	3		(Score x Weight of 10) =	
		2			
		1			
Management Capacity – Feasibility, duplication, adequate budget and O&M capability, likelihood of project being completed.		2		(Score x Weight of 10) =	
6. Measurable Outcomes: Project identifies improvements to people's lives, improvements in the delivery of services, expansion or improvement of services. CATEGORY WEIGHT 10		Criteria Description:	Rating:	Score	Point Total
Improving People's Lives	Excellent: benefit to the entire community, county, or multiple jurisdictions	3		(Score x Weight of 10) =	
	Good: benefit to significant portion of the jurisdiction	2			
	Low: benefit to a limited group	1			
Community Collaboration – Demonstrated effort between more than one jurisdiction	Project includes some collaborative effort	1		(Score x Weight of 10) =	

Total Rating Score				
--------------------	--	--	--	--

Total Maximum Available Points 445

Comments _____
